power:
"He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and

"He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.
"He has torbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation until his assent should be obtained.
"He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers," &c.

These are a few of the complaints of the Declaration of Independence. You will remember many others of the same character. The war of the Revolution brought this contest to a close, and witnessed a second great triumph of the Whigs over their adversaries. Surely, sir, it will not be said that the men who achieved this triumph distrusted the capacity of the people to govern themselves. That, sir, was the great point

One thing is apparent in this declaration above all others. that the chief grievance complained of is the exercise of the veto to control the legislation of the colonies. The veto had become odious in England, and no monarch, from the time of William the Third, had had the temerity to employ it against the legislation of Parliament. But it had been employed against colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, to the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in various ways, the great discount of the colonial legislation in the colonial content of the country—almost as frequently, sir, and as ca-priciously as it has been employed of late years by our Presi-dents against the legislation of Congress. The Whig spirit of 1776 revolted against it, and that spirit was never appeas-ed until it was supposed we had secured to ourselves the right of self-government and the supremacy of the will of the peo-ple. The establishment of American independence and the subsequent adoption of the constitution, it was believed, had thoroughly secured this great object. It is true that a qualified veto was incorporated in the constitution. But this was done not without dissent on the part of some of the most intelligent and sturdy republicans in the Convention—of whom Dr. Franklin was one of the most conspicuous. The veto was at last only allowed upon the representation made by the friends of the clause that it was a power of such a character as would rarely be brought into use, and which would be found to be sufficiently guarded from abuse by the jealousy with which a Republican Government would naturally watch its exercise. The argument was, that as monarchical England had not witnessed its exhibition for nearly a hundred years, republican America would surely find but few occasions to employ it. Yielding to such arguments, the Convention adopted the qualified veto, as we now read it in the constitution.

Sir, it is this veto which, as much as any thing else worthy of note in the latter Administrations of our Government, has re-embodied the Whig party. The veto power has utterly re-embodied the Whig party. The veto power has utterly disappointed the expectations and overthrown the promises of the authors of the constitution. It was intended, as the present Secretary of State once truly said, for "the extreme medicine" of the constitution, and it has become instead "its daily bread." It is no longer a qualified veto, but a party veto. It has never, in this latter day of its abuse, been used by a President against the measures of his own party; but its use has been frequent, almost invariable, against the promi-nent measures of his political opponents, when he and his party were in a minority in Congress. You cannot find a single measure of this new Democratic party that has been ve-toed: there has not been a great and prominent Whig mea-sure, on the contrary, that a Democratic President has not It seems to be almost a badge or test of this new De mocracy that some bill or other shall be forbidden. There i scarcely a little mayor of a little corporation who stands up for his democracy who does not think it essential to his democratic character that he shall veto some act of his little Whig Common Council—"this pump or that lamp shall not be re-paired: let them become extinct, to prove my devotion to De-

It has thus, sir, been made the great instrument for the increase of Executive power, and, taken in connexion with the employment of Executive patronage to enlist parties in support of that power, it has wrought almost a civil revolution in the nature of our Government, converting it from one of re-publican equality and popular will into one of party proscription and high monarchical prerogative. No constitutional monarchy has witnessed the exercise of higher or broader Ex-ecutive power than that with which we have become familiar ublic of ours. The veto, as applied a dezen times in the last twenty years in this country, would have termina-

Sir, what was known in the United States as the old De morratic party was moulded, in a great degree, by Mr. Jefferson. Its antagonist was the old Federal party. Doubtless, sir, in the lapse of time, many men belonging to these two parties have honestly changed sides. Throwing out of view all that was personal in the feelings of these parties and which belonged to the deep of these trips. belonged to the day of their strife, and throwing off also all consideration of what was local or temporary in their respective points of difference, there was ground enough left for sincere and hearty conciliation of sentiment and feeling in regard to the questions of fundamental policy in the administration of our public affairs. I think that this conciliation of opinion and surrender of the prejudices and asperities of party feeling are very notable at the close of Mr. Madison's administration and very notable at the close of Mr. Madison's administration throughout the whole career of those of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Adams which followed it. But if we look to the questions came into power, we shall find that these regarded, more or less, the views then entertained in reference to the Executive. Mr. Jefferson himself has expressed this in a letter which has been often quoted and with which this meeting is familiar. I will not pretend to say that he may not have overstated this question of difference; but it entirely answers my present purpose to show what were Mr. Jefferson's opinions, whether correct or not, as to the distinctive differences between the Dethat day and the Federalists. For whether th Federalists entertained the opposite opinions as strongly as Mr. Jefferson imputed them or not, this letter of his leaves no doubt as to what he considered cardinal doctrines of his own party. The letter to which I refer was written by Mr. Jeferson to Mr. John Adams the elder, in 1813, in the course of a friendly correspondence, at a date in the life of each when all political acrimony had subsided and given place to the ori-

ginal sentiments of friendship which they had cultivated in their earlier manhood. In this letter Mr. Jefferson says: "The terms Whig and Tory belong to national as well as evil history. They denote the temper and constitution of mind of different individuals. To come to our own country mind of different individuals. To come to our own country and to the times when you and I became first acquainted, we well remember the violent parties which agitated the old Congress and their bitter contests. There you and I were arrayed together: others cherished the monarchy of England, and we the rights of our country.

"But as soon as it (the constitution) was put in motion the line of division was arrain desern. We hooke into two parties.

"But as soon as it (the constitution) was put in motion the line of division was again drawn. We broke into two parties, each wishing to give the Government a different direction—the one to strengthen the most popular branch; the other the more permanent branches and to extend their permanence. Here you and I separated for the first time, and as we had been longer than most others on the public theatre, and our names were, therefore, more familiar to our countrymen, the party which considered you as thinking with them placed your name at their head: the other, for the same reason, selected mine."

This is a distinct and leting agent, the settled M. Let.

This is a distinct and plain avowal on the part of Mr. Jef-ferson that one of the fundamental and characteristic differences recognised by him as separating the Democratic party from the Federal was, that he and his friends looked to the predominance and strength of the Legislature as the Whigs of old had looked to it in England as the best guaranty of free Gov-

more to the enlargement of the Executive power.

Sir, which was right, according to the experience this Government has had through the last fifty years? That Democratic party which at that day proclaimed its identity with the Whigs of past time, and which was identical, in this sentiment at least, and, as I shall show hereafter, in all other forms st, and, as I shall show hereafter, in all other fundamental characteristics with the present Whig party, or the Federalists of that period, if Mr. Jefferson has correctly re presented them in contending for the Executive? No Whig of the present time can doubt on that point. That our oppo-nents do now take the ground imputed by Mr. Jefferson to the Federalists in this question you have the most manifold proofs. You have proof of this, sir, in the strong and emphatic terms in which they daily justify and extol the veto, in the most licentious exercise of it during the last twenty years. You have other cogent proofs of it in the open and reiterated declarations of their leading men in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives, that it is necessary to guard the Executive against the encroachments of the Le-gislature; that it is the legislative body which is apt to grow dangerous to public liberty. Nothing is more familiar to us now than to hear the voto called a great conservative power, by which the President manual to the conservative power,

where, where there is a public officer, and you will find the stipendiaries and employes of the Executive, the office-holders occupying every rostrum and public forum to teach the people these blessings of Executive mastership. Not a man amongs them speaks up for the Legislature; not a word is heard from them responsive to that old Whig sentiment which taught our fathers the value of an independent representative Legislature and the danger of trusting the Executive with the Legislature and the danger of trusting the Executive with the

reference to this great and engrossing question of Executive power and influence, we are precisely on the ground occupied by Mr. Jefferson; and it is worthy of remark that Mr. Jefferson, acting in conformity with these principles, never in the course of his eight years of public administration put his veto upon a single act of the Legislature; never "pocketed" a bill, as it is called; never said, "if you had consulted me I could have given you a bill better than the one you sent me." Such doings belong only to the era of the new Domocracy. And, sir, so far as the present position of our adversaries has reference to this same great and engrossing question, I will not say it is coincident with that of the Federalists at the period to which Mr. Jefferson alludes, but it goes a bowshot beyond any thing advocated by the Federalists of that time; it is ultra and extra Federal in the sense in which these doctrines have ever been imputed to the Federal party. It is, in fact, a revival of the most odious and offensive doctrines of the cavaliers of Charles the First's time—the very antipodes of all that we have been taught as vital to the success and distinctive excellence of free representative Government. So much, sir, for this question. Now, let us look at other

nestions which are declared to enter into the organization of

In the platform of the new Democracy the Whigs are charged with being the advocates— 1. Of the constitutionality and expediency of a nationa

2. Of the constitutionality and expediency of making ap propriations for internal improvements, roads, canals, rivers and harbors.

3. Of the constitutionality and expediency of tariffs for the protection of the labor of the country.

And, on the other hand, these builders of the platform clair

And, on the other hand, these builders of the platform claim for themselves to be opposed to the Whigs on all these points: to be irreconcileably adverse to the constitutionality of a bank; equally so to that of internal improvements; and, on the point of protection to American labor, they declare themselves at last, after abundant equivocation, the enemies of all useful and effective legislation having reference to that. Their most authentic exponents amongst their public speakers and their newspapers go even further than this, and boast the party to be the strenuous and determined advecates of free trade.

These three questions—the bank, the internal improvement, and the tariff—present what the party have for years past claimed to be the chief distinctive topics upon which they stand opposed to the Whigs. They are the tests of political fraternization. They who support the affirmative on these propositions are, in the new nomenclature of that anomalous party who have erected the Baltimore platform, Federalists; hey who take the negative on those questions call themselve

the Democracy.

I am aware that the Baltimore platform professes to exhibit some other materials for party distinction; it contains a schedule of minor political wares, which seem to have been thrown in for the sake of show. They are, in part, declarations con cerning liberty and equality, which ho party nor man in this country has ever disputed; and, in part, some very solemn trumpery touching a disclaimer of the exercise of doubtful powers; their attachment to a strict construction of the constitution; and their respect for the will of the people; all of which assumes an air of ridicule when the professions of the party on these points are brought into contrast with their rei-

terated and constant practice.

Now, sir, coming to the consideration of these prominent differences in the policy of the two parties, I affirm that this Baltimore platform party stand at this day radically in opposition to the whole theory and practice of the old Democratic party whose name they have endeavored to usurp; that they are antagonists of that party in all points; that they have nothing in common with it, either of sentiment or action; and that in all they do and say, in all that they uphold, and all that they reject, they disparage and discredit that party and endeavor to bring it into contempt with the country; that, in fact, not being democratic themselves, they do not understand or do not value the principles which constituted the party of Jefferson and Madison. Let us look at the position of the Democratic party in its best days in reference to these ques-

I will not say, sir, that Mr. Jefferson was satisfied of the constitutionality of the bank. During his Administration that was not a party question. His Cabinet was divided upon this point. He and Mr. Madison were against it; Mr. Gallatin and Mr. Smith were in favor of it. But, at the same time, sir, no one was more ready to testify to the usefulness of the bank than Mr. Jefferson. I have a letter of his in my possession written to Mr. Wirt in 1811, in which, speaking of Mr. Gallatin's support of the bank and its importance to the Trea-

" I know he derived immense convenience from it, be they gave the effect of ubiquity to his money, wherever deposited. Money, in New Orleans or Maine, was at his command, and by their agency transformed, in au instant, into money in London, in Paris, Amsterdam, or Canton."

As the Cabinet was divided, so was the Democratic part in Congress divided upon it. Upon this question it was well known that the vote of each House furnished but a majority of one against it. It was not, therefore, a party question at that day. Subsequently, as I shall have occasion to show, the Democratic party adopted a settled opinion in favor of the

body knows—every body, at least, in this section of the country—that the Cumberland road originated in the administration of Mr. Jefferson, and that he signed the first bill which brought it into existence. Every body also knows, sir, that the first system of internal improvements was, at a later date, proposed to the nation by Mr. Calboun, and was, to use the language of Mr. McDuffle, "carried through the House of Representatives by a large majority of the Republicans, including almost every one of the leading men who carried us through the late war." This, sir, alludes specifically to that party which have always been recognised as the special triends and supporters of Mr. Jefferson—the Democrats of

Now, sir, as to the Tariff-or the Protective System. No statesman in America has been more explicit upon this subject, none more thoroughly impressed with a sense of its value than Mr. Jefferson. He was the advocate of protection for the sake of protection. He was not conversant in this cant of incidental protection, and judicious tariffs, and had never contemplated the ingenious mystification of a Kane letter, or the pithy equivocations of a modern Democratic banner. No, sir, he marched boldly up to the question, and talked of laying duties for the protection of American labor—countervailing duties against the policy of other nations—looking to them mainly to answer the ends of protection, and recommending them when necessary to his object, whether they might produce revenue or not. These opinions of his are familiar to the country. "When a nation imposes high duties," says the country. "When a nation imposes high duties," says Mr. Jefferson, in his report to the House of Representatives in 1793, "on our productions, or prohibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind."

In his second annual message to Congress, in enumerating the subjects to which the attention of Government should be described by the same kind.

drawn, he uses this language:

"To cultivate peace, and maintain commerce and navigaion in all their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries as
nurseries of navigation and for the nurture of man, and protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances; to preserve the faith of the nation, &c.—these are the landmarks by
which we are to guide curelyes in all our proceedings." serve the faith of the nation, &c.—these are the landmar which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings.'

These are a few evidences of Mr. Jefferson's opinions upo this point. They speak for themselves, and render it unne-cessary that I should refer to other declarations of his equally strong and to the point. Contrast these opinions with the oracles of the Baltimore Convention, and with the ceaseless assaults of the papers and crators of this new counterfeit Democracy upon the Whigs, for remaining true to the faith of Mr. Jefferson, and you will be able to estimate the claims of this spurious party to the name they have usurped and the lineage to which they pretend.

But, sir, let as look at the Administration of Mr. Madison.

We may well suppose that eight years was scarcely sufficien to digest and mature the policy of the nation upon all the great questions which had been confided to the management of the Democratic party by the election of Mr. Jefferson. We are aware that time and experience are both requisite to enable the aware that time and experience are both requisite to enable the wisest statesmen to build up a system of administration which shall be found adequate to meet the emergencies of an active, industrious, and thriving nation. The men at the head of industrious, and thriving nation. The men at the head of affairs must find continual necessity to observe the progress of by which the President may save the people from their representatives; in other words, proclaiming that the people are not able to govern themselves by a representative legislature without some superior power, in the shape of a Chief Magistrate, to instruct them in what is good for themselves, and to deny them the privilege of doing what he may find it convenient to himself or his friends to prevent.

It is something new in the history of free government to hear these old prerogative notions of the Jameses and the Charleses of England revived, advocated, and enforced in these our days, and in republican America; and enforced, sir, by whom? Go now to Washington, to New York, Boston, any where, where there is a public officer, and you will find the stipendiaries and employes of the Executive, the office-holdtheir policy, and to make such occasional enfendments in i

day—settled under the auspices of one of the most intelligent and illustrious of Democratic Presidents, with his concurrence and aid, and carried through the forms of legislation by the most talented, patriotic, and apright leaders of the Democratic

nessed also, sir, the settlement of another great question. That was the year of the first high protective tariff. The act for regulating the duties passed in that year was, what in that day was regarded and intended to be, one of clear, avowed, and decided protection. It contained, amongst other things, duties on iron as high as \$2.50 per hundred weight, on indigo 15 cents a pound, on salt 20 cents a bushel, on spirits as high as 75 cents a gallon, on brown sugar 3 cents, and white 12 cents a pound. These are all high protective duties, laid for the sake of protection; and what I desire more particularly to call to your attention, in reference to this act, is, that i was the first act in American legislation in which the much talked of minimum principle was introduced, and introduced by the aid of Mr. Calhoun and other leading Southern De-This bill was signed by Mr. Madison on the 27th

of April, 1816.
Thus, sir, it was reserved to Mr. Madison's administration to sottle the question of the constitutionality and expediency of the protective system in favor of domestic labor, just as it was his fortune to settle the question of the bank—that is to say, sir, by the zealous aid and co-operation of the great Demo-

cratic party of the nation.

Now, sir, the internal improvement question, which is the next in these three cardinal measures by which parties are claimed to be distinguished, had been already settled by the highest Democratic authorities in the case of the Dismal Swamp Canal and that of the Cumberland road. In reference to this road, allow me to refer to Mr. Jefferson's message of the 19th of February, 1808, to show to what point he contemplated its

final extension. He says :, final extension. He says:.

"I have approved of the route proposed as far as Brownsville, with a single deviation which carries it through Uniontown, from thence to the Ohio, and the point within the legal
limits at which it shall strike that river is still to be decided,"
&c. * * "In this way we may accomplish a continued
and advantageous line of communication from the seat of the
General Government to St. Louis, passing through many interesting points of the Western country."

Appropriations were frequently made to this road during
Mr. Madison's Administration; and I believe in no case did
they ever accounter a serious emosition from any Democratic

they ever encounter a serious opposition from any Democratic portion of the House. The bills for making these appropria-tions were invariably signed by Mr. Madison. But we have a still more explicit avowal of his opinions in reference to this question in one of his lust messages—that of 1815—in which he suggests to Congress the propriety of giving their attention to internal improvements as amongst the first duties devolved upon them after the return of peace. His language in this message was :

"Among the means of advancing the public interest, the oc-casion is a proper one for recalling the attention of Congress to the great importance of establishing throughout our country the roads and causes which can best be executed under the nathe roads and canals which can best be executed under the na-ticaal authority. No objects within the circle of political economy so richly repsy the expense bestowed upon them; there are none the utility of which is more universally ascer-tained and acknowledged; none that do more honor to the Government, whose wise and enlarged patriotism duly appre-ciates them."

These suggestions are concluded with the following remark : It is a happy reflection that any defect of constitutional au-hority which may be encountered can be supplied in a mede which the constitution has providently pointed out." This clause in the message has reference to some doubts which had obtained at that time touching the right of the Government to misistration was kept in the hands of the Democratic party. construct public works, as distinct from the right to make aupropriations for them. This latter right was almost univer-sally acknowledged and practised upon by the Democratic par-ty; the former had excited considerable diversity of opinion. t is in deference to this diversity of opinion that Mr. Madison's concluding suggestion is made; made, sir, I would observe, without intimating his own conviction on the one side or the other. Leaving this minor consideration out of view, (for certainly, if the power of appropriation is admitted, the speial mode of constructing these works is a question of mino importance.) this message is conclusive to show the warm and nearty approbation given by Mr. Madison to that policy of provement which the Democracy of our day regard with so much horror and denounce with such clamorous reite My object is to show, sir, that the Whigs upon this quession, as upon the others to which I have alluded, stand side by side with Mr. Madison.

Now, sir, I have reviewed the essential elements of the old

Democratic platform in 1816: the Madisonian platform. Sir, I want no better platform than that of James Madison. I know no better test or rule by which to examine or measure the genuine Democratic party than that supplied by the Ad-ministration of this wise, virtuous, and true hearted patriot. In my vocabulary that man is a Democrat who sustains the measures of this Administration. He who does not sustain, but repudiates them, is no Democrat, whatever nickname he

may choose to adopt.

It will not do, sir, to talk to us about "Progressive Democracy," when the question before us is the interpretation of the powers of the Government. What was constitu-tional in 1816 is constitutional now. What was essentially then, cannot be less so now. Measures, I admit, may be more or less applicable to the wants of the people at different periods of their progress. It may be expedient at one day to establish a bank, for instance, or to increase a tariff, and less expedient to do so at another. These are considerations which are temporary and fluctuating in their nature, and may be enforced or abandoned, in different states of the country, without any abandonment of principle; but the great doctrines of the constitution are eternal, they endure as long as the Government, and cannot be maintained and repudinted without a correspondent change in the political faith of those who do so. The new Democracy, in regard to all these points which I have touched—essential, vital, and discrimina-tive as they were of the political character of a party—in all those points the new Democracy are the very antipodes of the old; and, in the same degree, is this new Democracy the an-tipodes of the Whigs. Try the Baltimore Convention party by this standard, and you will find that they have not, as I have said before, one single principle in common with the Democratic party of which Mr. Madison was the head; not

one. Try the Whig party by this standard, and you will find them identical with the Democracy of 1816.

But, sir, I have another test of the identity of these parties.

We have looked at the principles and policy of the Democratic party of 1816 : let us now look at the men who constituted conspicuous and prominent leaders of that party-men whose names have become incorporated with the histor of that party. I shall present you some of these, sir, as far as the lapse of time has enabled me to summon them to our

Amongst the men most conspicuous in sustaining the De-John Quincy Adams, I have to name Albert Gallstin, the Secretary of the Treasury under Messrs. Jefferson and Madison both, Robert Smith, the Secretary of the Navy of Mr. Secretary of the Trensury under Messrs. Jefferson and Madison both, Robert Smith, the Secretary of the Navy of Mr. Jefferson and Secretary of State of Mr. Madison; James Monroe himself, Mr. Madison's Secretary of State, and afterwards President; and Dallas, Criswford, Granger, Meigs, Crowninshield, Jones, Thompson, Southard, John McLean, James Barbour, Shelby, Armstrong, Porter, Rodney, Pinkney, Wirt. These, sir, with others I might name, were members of the Cabinet, at orbet ime or other, during these administrations.

its most trying perils. After him, I name a host of others, his companions in the conflicts of that time, who labored with him to exalt the honor of his country in the development of every great principle by which free government and the prosperity of our Union were to be inseparably bound together and rendered perpetual. I recall, in this connexion, the names of Sergeant, Lowndes, Calhoun, (for at one time, sir, he was a strong Whig.) Morrow. Pope, Hemphill, Darling-spicuous in the country, and invariably obtained high positon, Vance, Metcelie, Whittlesey, Wright, Letcher, Cristen-den, James, Brown, Johnston, Poindexter, Root, Schenck, Lacock; many of whom are yet living to illustrate the Whig party, and nearly all of whom have bonne a conspicuous part in the Whig contests of our time. I mention these names at the Whig contests of our time. I mention these names at random, as men familiar to the memory of the nation in the ranks of the old Democracy. Those who hear me will be able to add many to this list. We are more familiar, sir, with our Maryland Democrats of the old school. Let us examine where they are in this relation. I may fell into some I may name in this list, but I am sure I am right as to much the larger number of them: I think, with regard to all.

Where I are wrong you will correct me. There is Kent, who to ster. much the larger number of them: I think, with regard to all. tude his Where I am wrong you will correct me. There is Kent, who to steer. Where I am wrong you will correct me. There is Kent, who served the State in both houses of Congress through the administrations of Madison, Monroe, and Adams, and who tived to hold a conspicuous place in the Whig ranks, Lloyd, Pinckney, Archer, Alexander McKim, Wright, Mitchell, Peter, Reed, Bayley, Ringgold, Smith—for Gen. Smith, sir, was a good Whig in all his opinions—Barney, Hayward, Semmes, Spence—I may add to these Gabriel Davall, first a representa-

Alexander Everett, Dutee J. Pearce, Harmanus Bleecker. These are a few, out of Maryland. We are more conversant with those at home. Let us reckon some of them. There was the late General Harper, the present Chief Justice of the United States, Mr. Taney, Judge Heath, Mr. Carmichael, of the Bastern Shore, the late Mr. George Winchester, Judge Frick, Mr. Herbert, General Howard, the late Mr. Francis Key, of the District of Columbia—all our Governors, and candidates for Governor, nominated by the Baltimore Convention party in this State, since the constitution gave the election to the people: Governor Grayson, Governor Francis Thomas, Mr. Carroll, the candidate of 1814, and the present Governor of the State. Sir, that party has never been abl

to find a candidate for Governor out of the old Federal ranks.

These, sir, are the men who have in past times, and in the present, been arrayed against the party of Mr. Madison, and neir intelligence and their integrity to believe that they have had any purpose to induce any one to infer that they have re-nounced their often expressed convictions of political duty, and abendoned their opposition to that o'd party against whom they have been accustomed to contend. The masses of the new Democracy have come to them, they have not budged

from their old ground.
These new combinations in the politics of the present day may be easily understood by a reference to the history of par-ties in a later era than that of Mr. Madison.

Sir, the administration of Mr. Monroe was conducted through a period of almost profound political calm. The setn platform—seemed to have quieted al! discontent, subjued all party exasperation. From that time forward the politics of the National Government appeared only to be divided on the question of men—not measures. The measures upon which the country had settled were too popular for assault. The country grew prosperous under their influence; and not until the administration of Mr. Adams did there arise Not, sir, that there was any proscription of men holding office, for proscription in those days was unknown; it did not being to the principles of the old Democratic party; but I men, sir, that no Federalist was brought into the Cabinet, either during the time of Mr. Monroe or Mr. Adams.

The election of Gen. Jackson produced a new era, a new course of administration, new men, and new measures. In 18.6 Gen. Jackson wrote a letter to Mr. Monroe—this was jus after Mr. Monroe's election was escertainedheadvised the President elect to discard all party divisions in his administration. "The Chief Magistrate (said he) of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party Every thing depends on the selection of your ministy"-" consult no party in your choice." This was Gen. Jackson's advice. That letter was published all over the Uzion. It brought large portions of the Federal party to Gm. Jackson's support; it was applauded, besides, by great numbers of the Democratic party; it made him very popular

with both.

Gen. Jackeon was elected in 1829. His inaugural address presented strong Whig views. He spoke in favor of limiting "the Executive power;" in favor of the protection of manufactures; in favor of "internal improvement and the diffusion of knowledge, so far as they can be promoted by the constitutional acts of the General Government." And "I will give heed (he says) to the correction of those abuses which have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into con-flict with the freedom of elections."

Then, sir, in his first message, we had, first, the recom-mendation of a tariff that "should place our manufactures in fair competition with those of other countries;" second, of inland navigation and the construction of highways in the several States; and, lastly, a National Bank, to be founded on the credit and revenues of the Government."

All this, sir, seemed to bid fair for the complete security our Madisonian platform. I will not pursue the history this Administration so far as to show how bitterly all the promises were disappointed. My object is to trace the progress of parties, and to show how the leading men of the

ation were disposed.

Gen. Jackson's was the first administration which, since the days of Mr. Jefferson, brought the Federalists into power. cting upon the advice which, twelve years before, he given to Mr. Monroe, he consulted no party in the choice of his cabinet, but constructed it indifferently of Democrats and

In his cabinet were Mr. Taney, Mr. McLane, Mr. Livingston, and Mr. Berrien—all distinguished Federalists. M Van Buren, who was at the head of the cabinet, had oppose Mr. Madison's nomination in 1812, for a second termthen oposed to the war-and had taken ground with the Fe deral party. It is true that he subsequently renounced this op-position when he found it was likely to be fruitless. Mr. Woodbury was also a member of this cabinet: he had been elected Governor of New Hampshire but a few years before by the aid of the Federal party in that State. It was manifestly Gen. Jackson's design, in making these appointments, to chliterate the old party distinctions, and to give to the Fe deralists a liberal participation in the Government. It he had persevered in the scheme of administration suggested in his inaugural, that is, if he had adhered to the Madi his inaugural, that is, if he had adhered to the Madisonian plat-form, it is probable he would have accomplished almost the annihilation of parties. His administration, on the contrary, finally took the most decided grounds of opposition to the whole of this scheme of policy. The voto power was called to his aid, and used with the most reckless despotism in the effort to curb and control Congress: a bitter system of proscription was adopted; the bank was overthrown, the tarif threstened and assailed, and the internal improvements ar-rested. All those who were attached to the policy thus overcalled the Whig party—in other words, revived the old De-morratic party of 1816.

During Gen. Jackson's time his party was called "the Jackson party." The all the party was called "the

and strenuous supporters of what I have called use and strenuous supporters of what I have called use and strenuous supporters of what I have called use and strenuous supporters of what I have called use and strenuous supporters of what I have called use and strenuous supporters of them lived long enough to take a part in the organization of the Whig party, and have been distinguished for their support of that party to the latest period of their lives.

Now, sir, who were the supporters of these administrations in Congress? I will name first and foremost, as first in our affections and dearest in all our memories, Heury Clay, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the great champion and best support to the prosperity of the country. It is true, too, sir, that many of the former Democratic party adhered to Gen. Jackson through all his changes, allured by the brilliancy of his popular repute, his military fame, and the bold and startling vigor of his character. Nearly all the political rederalists of the country—if I may so describe that portion of their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment, and their party who were ambitious of public employment. who feit most acutely the long proscription or denial under which they had lived since 1800—all rallied the more closely to his support and took the control of his Administration; that is, assumed the lead in the organization of the masses in his tions of honor and emolument. Upon this foundation the Jackson party erected, and upon this foundation grew to what we have seen it. During all the period of Jackson's Chief Magistracy we heard nothing about a Democratic party. The Whigs were content with their name, because it embo-died, through the force of historical recollections, the chief

People and the prerogative of the Crown. The revolution of 1688 in England was the final triumph of the popular party, and the consumantion of all that had been sought for by the Whigs in the long conflict of that century. The same context grew up in the colonies nearly a hundred years afterwards. In seed not recount the grounds of a representative garding against the Executive of the presentative Legislature. The Deckaration of privileges of a representative Legislature. The Deckaration of the properties of th say, sir, that throughout the State of Maryland, where we know the people best, you shall find the most influential and approved of the old Democratic leaders in the Whig ranks.

Then, sir, who opposed the Democratic Administrations of Madison, Monroe, or Adams? I can farnish you a few names for that list. Out of our own State, I am not sufficiently far addition, and the identification of his friends with the old Federal morphoses. By the legerdemain of this operation Mr. Clay, Mr. Sergeant, and Mr. Crittendem—and I name them only as a description of a whole party in the country—ald tried, and miliar with the political men of the past to give you as large a catalogue as many others might do; but I can give you a few.

There is James Buchanan, the present Secretary of State;

be, without any fault of their own, without the slightest change catalogue as many others might do; but I can give you a few. There is James Buchanan, the present Secretary of State; Henry Hubbard, of New Hampshire, he who figured so conspicuously in the nomination of Mr. Polk; Garret Wall, of New Jersey, Ruel Williams, of Maine, William Wilkins, of Pittsburg, Henry D. Gilpin, now cast away on the sandbar of the Free Soil party, Judge Kane, Mr. Polk's correspondent, Richard Rush, first a Federalist, afterwards a Whig, and now one of the new Democracy, Charles J. Ingersoll, John P. Cushman, Croswell, of the Albany Argus, Martin Chittenden, former Governor of Vermont, Bryant of the Evening Post, in New York, Bancroft, now the Minister in England, the late Alexander Everett, Dutee J. Pearce, Harmsons Bleecker. can say as much I am not concerned to inquire. The party seems to have been guided by that dexterous precept an-nounced in the ballad—

" If we cannot alter things Why, then, we'll change their names, sir." Ever since the success of this feat, the new Democracy

seem to have been as much at a loss to find their principles, as Japhet to discover his father. The whole career of the party, from that day to this, has been one of experiment. We have seen them in the course of twenty years, on both sides of every question, either of doctrine or policy. At one time they were for a bank, afterwards against it: First, against the substreasury, then for it: es to the tariff, the peculiarity of their position is, that they have been for it and against it all the time—for and against at the same moment: they were present, been arrayed against the party of Mr. Madison, and the Madisonian platform. These are the Federalists of that day, when the Democracy was embodied under Madison, Monroe, Adams, Crawford, and Clay: they are now the leaders of the party of the Baltimore platform. Sir, they have not changed their principles. I will do them the justice to say that, by whatever accidents or contrivances of the day it has come to pass that they are found enrolled under a new has come to pass that they are found enrolled under a new name, such of them as are now alive are no less opposed to the principles and party of Mr. Madison than they ever were. Amongst the names I have enumerated I have some highly the principles and party of Mr. Madison than they ever were.

Amongst the names I have enumerated I have some highly esteemed personal friends, and have too much respect both for their intelligence and their integrity to believe that they bave wonder that such a party should be angry at us because we do not build as many as they do?

Sir, there is one thing to which they have been invariably

true, and that is to the encouragement and extension of the Executive power of the Government. In that they have been consistent with all their past history. They have pursued this with an eager zeal, which time has not abated nor circumstance diverted from its object. In this they have been unremittingly constant and true to the original principles of their organization. The veto power has been their hobby—their ready aid in every time of need—the darling or their thoughts. It is their favorite threat in Congress against any and every party-denounced measure, which the people have guthered force sufficient to carry through that body: it is the staple of their boastings out of Congress, how efficacious the velo is to save the people from their own representatives. In the history of the veto—before the new Democracy had shed their light upon a benighted country—it had been used in forty years but eight times; that is, on an average, once in five years; and then, only upon new questions and on considerations which obtained for it a full acquiescence: not once on mere party grounds. In the succeeding eighteen years, marking the period of the new illumination, it has been used in one form or another; that is, in the direct application of it, or indirectly by "pocketing"—to use the common phrase—the tills of Congress—twenty-three times: eleven times by the flat veto, and twelve times by the pocketing process. This, too, always, with perhaps one or two exceptions, upon party grounds. It has been used repeatedly upon the same question, notwithstanding that the people have, over and over again, elected representatives to renew the same legislation in Congress, and upon which the President had submitted to Congress, and

judgment upon the subject in question.

This has been particularly exemplified in the case of the river and harbor bills of several successive years.

Again, sir, the Executive has been sustained by the puriy

Again, sir, the Executive has been sustained by the party not only in its vetoes, but even more conspicuously in the complacency with which it has been allowed to dictate to the legislation of Congress. It may be truly affirmed that between these two forms of directing the Executive influence, Congress has lost so much of its independence in the last twenty years as to reader it a body of less freedom of will be the besidetures of either France or England. Sir than the legislatures of either France or England. Sir, during those twenty years there has scarcely been one great and important measure of legislation proposed by the Whigs and carried by the voice of the people, through their repre-sentatives, that has not been frustrated by the veto. There was the regulation of the currency by a bank; there was the distribution of the public lands; there was the improvements by roads and canals; the protection of the rivers and har-bors. Twice was the tariff vetoed, and only suffered to pass

in no other form.

On the other hand the Executive, by force of its will, and against the opinions of the people, and is some cases against the direct votes of Congress until the party was better drilled, compelled the adoption of the most im-portant measures which have been carried into effect, and under which the country has suffered its severest misfortunes. Amongst these I n to the specie circular, as it was called, and the subsequent adoption of it by Congress, after that body had rejected it: the Subtreasury which stands in the same category; the annexation of Texas; the war with Mexico; the issue of Government paper, exchequer bills, &c.; and

the tariff of 1846. In both of these lists you may recognise the most signif cant measures, for good and evil, of the last twenty years: the first invariably frustrated by the interposition of the Exe-cutive; the latter invariably carrid by it. Now, sir, it is the xercise of this royal prerogative that attracts the unmeaed commendation of the new Democracy; it is this same feature of public administration that, more than any thing else, embodies and unites the Whig party against it. Which of the two parties has the ride of the real parties and the ride of the ride of

of the two parties has the side of the people in this contest.

Yet, in the face of a controversy such as this, and of such a history as this, General Cass, in that letter of acceptance of the nomination to which I have referred, goes out of his way the nomination to which I have referred, goes out of his way to cast a reproach upon the Whig party, and to stigmatize it with a charge of infdelity to the great cause of free government. "The Whigs do not believe in the capacity of man for self government," is the import of his remark; "and therein are they mainly distinguished from us, (the new Democracy,) who do believe in it! That is the starting point, at which the two parties diverge. The Whigs are the lineal descendants of the old Federal party—we come in direct line from the old Democrats." This from Gen. Lewis Case, in a contest with Gen. Zeabayr Taylor. mest with Gen. Zachary Taylor!
Who was General Cass? If ancient memories are to b

usted, he was himself a Federalist ; wore the black cockade in the days when that was a badge; was elected to the Legisla-ture of Ohio as a Federalist, and only changed his name when he found profit in it. Such is the early story of Gen. Cass, who has undertaken to defame a whole party in the United States by what he manifestly regards as a pointed opprobrium, a deduction of their political origin from the same cradle in which he was nurtured himself. What makes this piece of detraction more edious is, not only that it is greesly untrue, as I have shown, but that it is also a severe, ungracious, and, having reference to the kindness he received in the Bultimore Convention, an ungrateful fling at his own party and personal

On the other hand, who is General Taylor, sgainst who this calumny is as much levelled as against any one else? An old, early, and unquestioned friend of Mr. Jefferson's administration—a Democrat from the beginning—a Democrat now, in the truest sense of the word—one who now, after a lifetime of sturdy and most honorable devotion to the service of his country, proclaims his attachment to the old-fashioned. Whis notions of constitutional power, as that recovery as in Whig notions of constitutional power, as that power was in-terpreted in the days when Executives had no ambition to over-step the due limits of their authority; when the people had no clination to tolerate such ambition if it existed; when vetoes were not in fashion, and when the National Legislature was

lowed to execute the will of the people.

Sir, Gen. Teylor's two letters to Captain Allison, on the weto power and the other topics there referred to, are worth more than all the political letters and political speeches to-gether which have been made in this canvass on either side of the question. There is more states manship there, more due appreciation of popular liberty and free government, more durappreciation of popular liberty and free government, more point-blank, upright and downright good sense, than can be distilled out of all General Case's life, political, civil, or military, giving him the benefit of the best things he has ever said

Monroe in the zeabus effort to perpetuate their policy. They have joined this party in the day of its conciliations and triumphs, and they have adhered to it through all its defeats and its adversity, thus giving a pledge of the sincerity of their attachment and the honesty of their convictions, for which they are eminently entitled to their country's thanks. Not many survive of these former days. Parties in the Not many survive of these former days. Parties in the country now are composed, in much the largest part, of a new generation who know nothing personally of the past. If the dead could be again reanimated and brought upon the political theatre, Madison and his compeers, his friends, partisans, champions and c.mrades, would form an army of Whigs. They could be nothing else without apostacy from all that they professed to uphold and admire in the administration of our form of Government. Such of them as have lived within the period of our personal knowledge were, almost to a man, the advocates of all the essential Whig doctrines; and, of the comparatively few that are now alive, the large majority are comparatively few that are now alive, the large majority are still so. But the young who have grown up since, and the numbers who have become citizens of our country from other climes—these two classes of citizens constituting together, perhaps, four-fifths of our population—are neither guided by personal knowledge of the past, nor by the effections which belong to the memory of a participation in the struggles of the past, and are, therefore, greatly liable to be misled by the name which this new past, has assumed and to be the past, and any derection, greatly has assumed, and to be thus beguiled from that scrutiny of its history and objects which it is
essential every man should make in order to understand it. I
am persuaded, sir, that if the people of the United States would
calmly study this history, and weigh the grave questions which t presents to their minds, there would not remain in the ranks of the Administration one tithe of that number which now give countenance and respectability to its struggles for scendency.
I am persuaded that the great mass of our countrymen,

whether native or adopted citizens, would rally with the Whigs around the principles and policy of the administration of Madison, and that this pinchbeck and copper-washed counterfeit of Democracy would be doomed to a short and lingering life in the hearts of the American people. The people intend to be right. They are carneally and deeply sensible of the value of free and pure representative Government. They admire right. They are carneatly and deeply sensible of the value of a free and pure representative Government. They admire and love our democratic representative system. They have unalterable faith in their capacity to govern themselves. Their sentiments are right, their purposes are good. The most dangerous impediment which they may have to encounter, in the accomplishment of all the high and glorious sims which they have proposed to themselves in this great enterprise of constructing the happiest Government upon earth, will be the listening with a too credulous ear to the teachings of those who may seek to poison their minds with the belief that the Executive of the nation is a better friend to freedom than the Legislature. Administration has too long already had the Legislature. Administration has too long already had the control of legislation. Let them be divorced; and let the President of the United States understand that it is the prerogative of the people to make the laws, and his duty to execute them as they come to his hand. It is the error of our time to suppose they come to his hand. It is the error of our time to suppose that the Chief Magistrate is a better judge of the wants of the people than the Chief Legislature. Give the people, through their legislature, full opportunity and power to enact what they desire, and the country will always be free and happy. This, sir, is the golden precept of General Taylor. It is worth, at this time, all the political wisdom of the day. It is his creed, his faith, his platform. Let the country elect him

COMMUNISM.

FROM THE JOURNAL OF COMMERCE. Various experiments made in this country to test the prac-

ticability of effecting the regeneration of society, by wild and chimerical schemes of reform, having for their basis the abelition of property, have signally failed. In France, where the reconstruction of the political edifice afforded an ampler scope for the radical renovation of the social system, the labors of the Communists, Fourierites, and Saint Simonians have only increased the misery and degradation of the masses whose conthe country all his objections. Thus showing that the veto dition they sought to elevate. These results are quite in accy of such theories is as obvious to reason as are the evils they propose to remedy. Wealth and want are near neighbors : but the policy were short-sighted that should endeavor to relieve by constraint the poverty of the one with the superfluity of the other. Polit cal revolutions are easy or difficult of a complishment, in proportion as the evils to be redressed are general or partial in their operation. In the overthrow of Louis Philippe the interests of a whole community prepen-derated over those of a dynasty. The right of assembling, the liberty of the press, rights essential to restrain abuses of administration and to keep the public burdens from transcend ing endurable limits, were important alike to rich and poor, and their violation and attempted withdrawal united all classes of the people against the king's government, and it was over thrown in an hour. But when the war of want broke out be tween the hovel and the house, under circumstances as favorable to the assailants as could well concur, the results proved teract the reckless desperation of poverty, and der the hopelessness of the struggle. But the plan proposed by Communism to remedy inequality in the distribution of proper-ty is to be condemned, not alone because of the apparently ty is to be concenned, not made to the appearance insuperable obstacles in the way of its execution, and because of the fruitless strife and bloodshed that would ensue from forcible efforts to establish it, but, in addition to these important considerations, because of its inefficacy to produce me than temporary relief. The fear of poverty and the ambition to become rich are the great stimulants to production, and the ambition and the fear are alike engendered by the constant contemplation of the existence of these two extremes. The labor and pains now applied to accumulate an aggregation of valuable things would cease simultaneously with the removal of emulation and anxiety. Why should a man strive for that which he has? The love of riches may impel men to labor who are secure of a provision for their wants; but no man will work, without the stimulus of want, who knows that the stranger will reap the fruit of his toil beyond what is required

for his own absolute necessities.

The effect of an enforced equality of property and condition upon the development of human character and capabilities, and upon the consequent progress of our race, is admirably described in the subjoined paragraph from a recent work of Mr. Mill, entitled "Principles of Political Economy, with some of their applications to Social Principles." The passage is part of a clear and decisive refutation of the principles of Communista and its kindred theories.

"Assuming, however, all the success which is claimed for this state of society by its partisons, it remains to be considered how much would be really gained for mankind, and whether the form that would be given to life, and the character which would be impressed on human nature, can satisfy any but a very low estimate of the capabilities of the species. Those who have never known freedom from anxiety as to the means of subsistence, ere apt to overrate what is gained for positive enjoyment by the mere absence of that uncertainty. The necessaries of life, when they have always been secure for the whole of life, are scarcely more a subject of consciousness or a scurce of happiness than the elements. There is little attractive in a monotenous routine, without vicissitudes, but without excitement; a life spent in the enforced observance of an external rule, and performance of a prescribed task; in which labor would be devoid of its chief sweetener, the thought that every effort tells perceptibly on the laborer's own interests or those of some one with whom he identifies himself; in which no one could by his own exertions improve his condition, or that of the objects of his private affections; in which no one's way of life, occupations, or movements, would de-pend on choice, but each would be the slave of all; a social evetern in which identity of education and pursuits would impress on all the same unvarying type of character, to the destruction of that multiform development of human nature, those manifold unlikenesses, that diversity of instessand talents, and variety of intellectual points of view which, by presenting to each innumerable notions that he could not have conceived of himself, are the great stimulus to intellect and the mainspring of mental and moral progression. The perfection of social arrangements would be to secure to all persons complete independence and freedom of action, subject to no restrictions but that of not doing injury to others; but the scheme which we are considering abrogates this freedom entirely, and places every action of every member of the community

HALF AND HALF .- We heard a good one a few days since of an old German woman, who keeps an inn somewhere in the Whig county of Somerset. Be it remembered, that though principles of their association, and recalled their democratic origin. The Jackson party, on the other hand, were sentent with theirs, because it expressed no fixed principles, and allowed them to embrace or reject whatever docfrines the turn of the political wheel might lift up or overthrow: it enabled them to follow their great leader into whatever political late tude his view of their means of success might prompt him to to steer.

When Mr. Van Buren succeeded General Jackson the party, being under a new leader, could no longer retain the party, being under a new leader, could no longer retain the party, being under a new leader, could no longer retain the party, being under a new leader, could no longer retain the party, being under a new leader, could not hope to work a spell by that designation. So, sir, at his, Mr. Van Buren party could not hope to work a spell by that designation. So, sir, at his, Mr. Van Buren's, suggestion, as I have reason to believe, they cunthe widow was cute enough in her particular line, she w